IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

LAURA HANSON,	Case No. 3:21-cv-780-SI
Plaintiff,	VERDICT
v.	•
STATE OF OREGON, LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,	
Defendant.	
We the Jury being duly empaneled and sv	worn do unanimously find as follows:
PLAINTIFF'S WORK WITH OREC	GON SENATOR GELSER BLOUIN
Questions 1 through 8 apply only to claims and e the Oregon Legislature while working with Oreg	
1. Has Ms. Hanson proven each elegiscrimination based on being p January 6, 2020? Yes No	laced on paid administrative leave on
Go to Question 2.	
2. Has Ms. Hanson proven each elegiscrimination based on termination. Yes No	ement of her claim of <u>disability</u> ation of employment on October 7, 2020?

Go t	o Question $3(A)$.		
3.		on proven each element of her claim ed on <u>termination of employment</u> on	
	Yes	No	
		Question $3(A)$, go to Question $3(B)$. If you are $3(B)$ and go to Question 4.	you answered "No" to
	(B) Has the Oregon hardship?	n Legislature proven its affirmative	defense of undue
	Yes	No	
Go t	o Question 4.		
4.		roven each element of her claim of g n being <u>placed on administrative lea</u>	
	Yes	No	
Go to	o Question 5.		
5.		roven each element of her claim of g n <u>termination of employment</u> on Oc	
	Yes	No	
Go to	o Ouestion 6		

6.	Has Ms. Hanson proven each element of her claim of <u>public employer</u> whistleblower retaliation based on being <u>placed on administrative leave</u> on January 6, 2020?
	Yes No
G	o to Question 7.
7.	Has Ms. Hanson proven each element of her claim of <u>public employer</u> whistleblower retaliation based on <u>termination of employment</u> on October 7 2020?
	Yes No
(ii	you: (i) answered "Yes" to <u>any one or more</u> of Questions 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, or 7; and/or answered "Yes" to Question (3)(A) <u>and</u> "No" to Question (3)(B); go to Question 8. Therwise, skip Question 8 and go to Question 9. What amount of noneconomic, compensatory damages, if any, has Ms. Hanson proven should be recovered for harm caused by the Oregon Legislature relating to her employment with <u>Oregon Senator Gelser Blouin</u> ?
	\$
	·
	PLAINTIFF'S WORK WITH OREGON REPRESENTATIVE PHAM
	9 through 11 apply only to claims and events related to Ms. Hanson's employment by n Legislature while working with Oregon Representative Pham.
9.	Has Ms. Hanson proven each element of her claim of <u>disability</u> <u>discrimination</u> based on termination of employment on January 25, 2023?
	Yes No
Gc	to Question 10(A).

10. (A) Has Ms. Hanson proven each element of her claim of <u>failure to</u> <u>accommodate</u> based on termination of employment on January 25, 2023?
Yes No
If you answered "Yes" to Question $10(A)$, go to Question $10(B)$. If you answered "No" to Question $10(A)$, skip Question $10(B)$ and go to the next italicized instructions.
(B) Has the Oregon Legislature proven its affirmative defense of undue hardship?
Yes No
If you: (i) answered "Yes" to Question 9; <u>and/or</u> (ii) answered "Yes" to Question 10(A) and "No" to Question 10(B); go to Question 11. Otherwise, your deliberations are done. Do not answer any more questions. Please have the presiding juror date and sign this form and inform the Courtroom Deputy that you are ready to return to the Courtroom.
11. What amount of noneconomic, compensatory damages, if any, has Ms. Hanson proven should be recovered for harm caused by the Oregon Legislature relating to her employment with <u>Oregon Representative Pham</u> ?
\$
Your deliberations are done. Please have the presiding juror date and sign this form and inform the Courtroom Deputy that you are ready to return to the Courtroom.
DATED this $\frac{1st}{u}$ day of $\frac{1}{u}$, 2024.